arXiv:1403.7757v1 [math.CO] 30 Mar 2014

ON SEYMOUR'S DECOMPOSITION THEOREM

S. R. Kingan [1]
Department of Mathematics
Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Brooklyn, NY 11210
skingan@brooklyn.cuny.edu

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a class of matroids closed under minors and isomorphism. Let N be a matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an exact k-separation (A, B). We say N is a k-decomposer for $\mathcal{M}$ having (A, B) as an inducer, if every matroid $M \in \mathcal{M}$ having N as a minor has a k-separation (X, Y) such that, $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$. Seymour [3, 9.1] proved that a matroid N is a k-decomposer for an excluded-minor class, if certain conditions are met for all 3-connected matroids M in the class, where $|E(M) - E(N)| \leq 2$. We reinterpret Seymour's Theorem in terms of the connectivity function and give a check-list that is easier to implement because case-checking is reduced.

1. Introduction

Excluded minor results are obtained by excluding certain minors and determining the 3-connected matroids without the excluded minors. If the class has few infinite families, then it may be possible to identify all of them. Often, however, there are too many 3-connected matroids with no pattern to get a precise identification of them. One approach is to raise the connectivity. It turns out that while 3-connected matroids are plentiful, internally 4-connected matroids are fewer. Determining all the internally 4-connected matroids in a class is not the same as determining all the 3-connected matroids in the class, but it gives a good understanding of the structure of the class. This amounts to asking whether a non-minimal exact 3-separation in a 3-connected matroid N gets carried forward in all 3-connected matroids in the class that contain N as a minor. Let us call such a matroid a 3-decomposer because it captures, in a sense, the decomposition present in all 3-connected matroids containing it as a minor. What is needed then is a quick and easy check to determine if a matroid is a 3-decomposer. In this paper we reinterpret on Seymour's Decomposition Theorem [3, 9.1] to present such an easy check.

The matroid terminology follows Oxley [2]. If M and N are matroids on the sets $E \cup x$ and E where $x \notin E$, then M is a *single-element extension* of N if $M \backslash x = N$, and M is a *single-element coextension* of N if $M/x = N$. If N is a 3-connected matroid, then an extension M of N is 3-connected provided x is not in a 1- or 2-element circuit of N. Likewise, M is a 3-connected coextension of N provided x is not in a 1- or 2-element cocircuit of N.

Let M be a matroid and X be a subset of the ground set E. The *connectivity function* λ is defined as $\lambda(X) = r(X) + r(E - X) - r(M)$. Observe that $\lambda(X) = \lambda(E - X)$. For $k \geq 1$,

[1]The author is partially supported by PSC-CUNY grant number 66305-00 43.

a partition (A, B) of E is called a k-separation if $|A| \geq k$, $|B| \geq k$, and $\lambda(A) \leq k-1$. When $\lambda(A) = k-1$, we call (A, B) an *exact k-separation*. When $\lambda(A) = k-1$ and $|A| = k$ or $|B| = k$ we call (A, B) a *minimal exact k-separation*. For $n \geq 2$, we say M is *n-connected* if M has no k-separation for $k \leq n-1$. A k-connected matroid is *internally $(k+1)$-connected* if it has no non-minimal exact k-separations. In particular, a simple matroid is 3-connected if $\lambda(A) \geq 2$ for all partitions (A, B) with $|A| \geq 3$ and $|B| \geq 3$. A 3-connected matroid is *internally 4-connected* if $\lambda(A) \geq 3$ for all partitions (A, B) with $|A| \geq 4$ and $|B| \geq 4$. In this case $\lambda(A) = 2$ is allowed only when either $|A|$ or $|B|$ has size at most 3.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a class of matroids closed under minors and isomorphisms. Let $k \geq 1$ and N be a matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ having an exact k-separation (A, B). Let M be a matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ having an N-minor. We say N is a *k-decomposer* for M having (A, B) as an *inducer* if M has an exact k-separation (X, Y) such that $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$. From a practical point of view we are interested in 3-connected matroids with non-minimal exact 3-separations. Suppose M is a 3-connected matroid having a 3-connected minor N and N has a non-minimal exact 3-separation (A, B). If N is a 3-decomposer for M, then M has a 3-separation (X, Y) such that $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$. In this case $\lambda(X) = 2$ and $|X| \geq 4$ and $|Y| \geq 4$. Hence, if N is a 3-decomposer for M, then M is not internally 4-connected. The converse is not true.

The first excluded minor class of matroids characterized in this manner was the class of regular matroids [3]. A matroid is *regular* if it has no minor isomorphic to the Fano matroid F_7 or its dual F_7^*. To decompose regular matroids, Seymour developed the Splitter Theorem, the Decomposition Theorem, and the notion of 3-sums. The Splitter Theorem describes how 3-connected matroids can be systematically built-up and the Decomposition Theorem (the subject of this paper) describes the conditions under which an exact 3-separation in a matroid gets carried forward to all matroids containing it.

The next theorem is the main result in this paper. It is equivalent to Seymour's Decomposition Theorem [3, Theorem 9.1]. When Seymour developed his Decomposition Theorem in 1980 finding the connectivity function of a matroid was a daunting task. Now the connectivity function of a matroid can be obtained with a click of a button in any matroid software. As such it is only natural to reinterpret Seymour's conditions in terms of the connectivity function to make it easier to use. Our theorem is, in a sense, a back-to-basics result because it says Seymour's Theorem is still a good way of finding internally 4-connected matroids.

Theorem 1.1. *Let N be a simple and cosimple matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an exact k-separation (A, B), such that A is the union of circuits and the union of cocircuits. Suppose $M \in \mathcal{M}$.*

(i) *If M is a simple single-element extension of N such that $M\backslash e = N$, then $\lambda_M(A) = k-1$ or $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$.*

(ii) *If M is a cosimple single-element coextension of N such that $M/f = N$, then $\lambda_M(A) = k-1$ or $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$.*

(iii) *Each matroid M that is a cosimple single-element coextension of a Type (i) matroid or a simple single-element extension of a Type (ii) matroid satisfies one of the following conditions:*

  (a) *$\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$;*

  (b) *If $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$, then either $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$ or $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triad or triangle with $g \in A$;*

(c) *If* $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ *and* $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$*, then either* $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$ *or* $\{e, f, g\}$ *is a triad or triangle with* $g \in A$*; or*
(d) *If* $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ *and* $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$*, then* $\{e, f, g\}$ *is a triangle or triad in* M *with* $g \in A$*.*

Then N *is a* k*-decomposer for every matroid in* $\mathcal{M}$ *with an* N*-minor.*

There are several points to note. First, observe that for $k \geq 4$, we do not have a splitter-type theorem that tells us how to construct k-connected matroids. From a practical point of view this result is used only for 3-connected matroids and 3-decomposers. Second, observe that if N is 3-connected, a simple single-element extension and a cosimple single-element coextension are also 3-connected.

Third, computing a matroid M where $M\backslash e/f = N$ is clearly more work than computing single-element extensions and coextensions of N, especially since we have to consider every single column and row and cannot use isomorphism. Anything that can be done to reduce the computation is worth it. Due to (iii)(a), many of the choices for extension columns and coextension rows are eliminated. This is a considerable savings of computation.

Lastly, observe that there is no symmetry between A and B. So for example, in the case of a matroid M of the form $M\backslash e/f = N$, having $\lambda_M(A) = 2$ is permissable, but $\lambda(A \cup \{e, f\}) = \lambda_M(B) = 2$ could be a problem. An example is given to illustrate this point at the end of the paper.

This example, also serves to show that if N has a non-minimal exact two separation (A, B) and for all M, such that $|E(M) - E(N)| \leq 2$, M has a non-minimal exact 3-separation (X, Y) such that $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$, that does not mean N is a 3-decomposer. In other words, just a 2-element check will not do, not even for binary matroids. The highly specialized conditions in Seymour's theorem (and equivalently our interpretation) must hold.

Next, we examine the situation when we add additional hypothesis on the exact 3-separation (A, B) of N. Specifically, suppose A is not only a union of circuits and a union of cocircuits, but a circuit and a cocircuit. Then $r_N(A) = |A| - 1$ and since B is a hyperplane $r_N(B) = r(N) - 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_N(A) &= r_N(A) + r_N(B) - r(M) \\ &= |A| - 1 + r(M) - 1 - r(N) \\ &= |A| - 2 \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose further that A is a 4-element circuit and cocircuit. Then $\lambda_N(A) = 2$. This is precisely the condition that is in Mayhew, Royle, and Whittle's Decomposition Theorem [1, Lemma 2.10].

Corollary 1.2. *(Mayhew, Royle, and Whittle) Let* N *be a* 3*-connected matroid in* $\mathcal{M}$ *such that* N *is not a wheel or a whirl and* N *has a non-minimal exact* 3*-separation* (A, B)*, where* A *is a* 4*-element circuit and cocircuit. If* A *is a circuit and a cocircuit in every* 3*-connected single-element extension and coextension of* N *in* $\mathcal{M}$*, then* N *is a* 3*-decomposer for every* 3*-connected matroid in* $\mathcal{M}$ *having an* N*-minor.*

We prove Theorem 1.1 by showing that it is equivalent to Seymour's Decomposition Theorem [3, 9.1]. To do this, in Section 2 we make a slight modification of Seymour's Theorem and show that the modified version is equivalent to the original version in [3]. In Section 3 we describe the updated techniques for finding single-element extensions and the connectivity function that led to this perspective on decomposition. In Section 4 we give the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2. Finally, in Section 5 we illustrate Theorem 1.1. by giving a short explanation for why R_{12} is a 3-decomposer for regular matroids.

2. A modification of Seymour's Decomposition Theorem

In this section we make a slight modification of Seymour's Decomposition Theorem [3, Theorem 9.1].

Theorem 2.1. *(Seymour's Decomposition Theorem) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a class of matroids, closed under minors and isomorphism. Let $N \in \mathcal{M}$, and let (A, B) be a partition of $E(N)$, with $\lambda_N(A, B) = k$. Suppose $N, \mathcal{M}$ have the following properties:*

(i) *For each $x \in A$, there is a circuit C and a cocircuit D of N containing x, with $C, D \subseteq A$.*

(ii) *For each $M \in \mathcal{M}$, if $M\backslash e = N$ and e is not a coloop of M, there is a circuit C_e of M with $e \in C_e$ and $C_e - \{e\}$ included in one of A, B.*

(iii) *For each $M \in \mathcal{M}$, if $M/f = N$ and f is not a loop of M, there is a cocircuit D_f of M with $f \in D_f$ and $D_f - \{f\}$ included in one of A, B.*

(iv) *For each $M \in \mathcal{M}$, if $M\backslash e/f = N$, suppose there is a cocircuit D of M with $\{e, f\} \subset D \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$; then either there is a circuit C of M with $x \in C \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ or e is parallel to an element of A in M/f.*

(v) *For each $M \in \mathcal{M}$, if $M\backslash e/f = N$, suppose there is a circuit C of M with $\{e, f\} \subset C \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$; then either there is a cocircuit D of M with $f \in D \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ or f is in series with an element of A in $M\backslash e$.*

Then $\lambda_M(A, B) = k$ for each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ with N as a minor.

The next result is equivalent to Theorem 2.1, but emphasizes the role of simple single-element extensions and cosimple single-element coextensions. As noted earlier, if N is 3-connected, a simple single-element extension and a cosimple single-element coextension are also 3-connected.

Theorem 2.2. *Let N be a simple and cosimple matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an exact k-separation (A, B) such that A is the union of circuits and the union of cocircuits. Suppose $M \in \mathcal{M}$.*

(i) *If M is a simple single-element extension of N by element e, then M has a circuit C_e containing e such that C_e is contained in $A \cup e$ or $B \cup e$.*

(ii) *If M is a cosimple single-element extension of N by element f, then M has a cocircuit D_f containing f such that D_f is contained in $A \cup f$ or $B \cup f$.*

(iii) *For each matroid M that is a cosimple single-element coextension of matroids of Type (i) or a simple single-element extension of matroids of Type (ii) having a circuit or cocircuit R containing e, f and $R \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$*

(a) *If R is a circuit, then either M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ or there is an element $g \in A$ such that $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triad in M.*
(b) *If R is a cocircuit, then either M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ or there is an element $g \in A$ such that $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triangle in M.*

Then N is a k-decomposer for every matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an N-minor.

Proof. The result follows provided we verify conditions (i) to (v) of Theorem 3.1. Note that (i) follows from the hypothesis because A is the union of circuits and the union of cocircuits. In order to verify Theorem 3.1(ii) and (iii), by duality we need to establish only Theorem 3.1(ii). Suppose $M\backslash e = N$ and e is not a coloop of M.

If M is not simple, then $C = C' \cup e$ is a circuit of M, for some $C' \subseteq E(N)$ such that $|C'| \leq 1$. As $C' \subseteq A$ or $C' \subseteq B$, it follows that $C' - e$ is included in A or B. Thus we have Theorem 3.1(ii).

If M is simple, then since M is a simple single-element extension of N by element e, $(A \cup e, B)$ is an exact k-separation for M. Therefore $r_M(A) = r_M(A \cup e)$. So there is a circuit C_e of M with $e \in C_e$ and $C_e - \{e\} \subseteq A$. Thus we have Theorem 3.1(ii).

In order to show Theorem 3.1(iv) and (v) again by duality we need to establish only (iv). Suppose $M\backslash e/f = N$ and M has a circuit R such that $\{e, f\} \subset R \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. First, consider the case that M is not simple nor cosimple. Then because N is simple and cosimple, e or f is contained in a non-trivial series or parallel class T of M.

Suppose T is a series class of M. If $f \in T$, then by orthogonality with R, there is $g \in (R - f) \cap T$ and therefore $D_f = \{f, g\}$ is a cocircuit of M containing f and $D_f \subseteq E \cup \{e, f\} - X$. This gives us Theorem 3.1(iv). If $f \notin T$, then $e \in T$. In this case T is a series class of M/f. So $T - e$ is a non-empty set of coloops of $N = M/f\backslash e$; a contradiction to the hypothesis.

Suppose T is a parallel class of M. If $e \notin T$, then $f \in T$ and $T - f$ is a non-empty set of loops of $N = M/f\backslash e$; a contradiction. Therefore $e \in T$. By (ii) applied to $M\backslash e$, there is a cocircuit D_f of $M\backslash e$ containing f such that $D_f - \{f\}$ is contained in one of A or B. Let D'_f be a cocircuit of M such that $D'_f - e = D_f$. If $D_f - f \subseteq B$, then f is contained in D'_f and $D' \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Theorem 3.1(iv) follows.

Therefore we may assume $D'_f - f \subseteq A$. By orthogonality with R, $D'_f = D_f \cup e$, since $D_f \cap R = \{f\}$. If $g \in T - e$, then, by orthogonality with D'_f, $g \in A$ or $g = f$. We will prove that $T = \{e, f\}$. Suppose $T \neq \{e, f\}$. We can choose g such that $g \in A$ and $(R - f) \triangle \{e, g\}$ contains a circuit R' of $N = M/f\backslash e$ satisfying $g \in R'$. So $R' - B = \{g\}$; a contradiction to orthogonality because N has a cocircuit containing g and contained in A (recall that (A, B) is a special k-separation for N). Thus we have shown that $T = \{e, f\}$. This is a contradiction because T is a parallel class and therefore $T = R$. From now on we may assume M is both simple and cosimple.

Suppose M is a cosimple single-element coextension of a Type (i) matroid or a simple single-element extension of a type (ii) matroid. Suppose this is not the case. Then M/f is not simple and $M\backslash e$ is not cosimple because M is both simple and cosimple. So M has a triangle T and a triad T^* such that $f \in T$ and $e \in T^*$. As $N = M\backslash e/f$ is both simple and cosimple, it follows that $\{e, f\} \subseteq T \cap T^*$, say $T^* = \{e, f, g\}$. If $g \in A$, then e and f are

in series in $M\backslash e$ and so Theorem 3.1(iv) follows. Thus we may assume that $g \in B$. Again Theorem 3.1(iv) follows because $f \in T^* \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Hence proved. $\square$

3. Updated Techniques

The author was introduced to structural results that involved computing single-element extensions by James Oxley. In the past, determining the non-isomorphic single-element extensions of a $GF(q)$-representable matroid required geometric insights and lengthy arguments. Now the author's matroid software program, Oid, calculates single-element extensions and groups them into isomorphism classes at the click of a button.

Let N be a $GF(q)$-representable n-element rank-r matroid represented by the matrix $A = [I_r|D]$ over $GF(q)$. The columns of A may be viewed as a subset of the columns of the matrix that represents the projective geometry $PG(r-1, q)$. Let M be a simple single-element extension of N over $GF(q)$. Then $N = M\backslash e$ and M may be represented by $[I_r|D']$, where D' is the same as D, but with one additional column corresponding to the element e. The new column is distinct from the existing columns and has at least two non-zero elements. If the existing columns are labeled $\{1, \ldots, r, \ldots, n\}$, then the new column is labeled $(n+1)$.

Suppose M is a cosimple single-element coextension of N over $GF(q)$. Then $N = M/f$ and M may be represented by the matrix $[I_{r+1}|D'']$, where D'' is the same as D, but with one additional row. The new row is distinct from the existing rows and has at least two non-zero elements. Since the columns of the original matrix $A = [I_r|D]$ are labeled $\{1, \ldots r, \ldots, n\}$, the columns of $[I_{r+1}|D'']$ are labeled $\{1, \ldots, r+1, \ldots, n+1\}$. The coextension element f corresponds to column $r+1$. The coextension row is selected from $PG(n-r, q)$, which means there could be a much larger selection of row vectors for the coextension.

We refer to the simple single-element extensions of N as Type (i) matroids and the cosimple single-element coextensions of N as Type (ii) matroids. The structure of type (i) and Type (ii) matroids are shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Structure of Type (i) and Type (ii) matroids

We can visualize the new element f as appearing in the new dimension and lifting several points into the higher dimension. Observe that f forms a cocircuit with the elements corresponding to the non-zero elements in the new row. Note that in $[I_{r+1}|D'']$ the labels of columns beyond r are increased by 1 to accomodate the new column $r+1$. So, if in a

rank 6 matroid N, $X = \{1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 11\}$, then in its single-element coextension M, the set corresponding to X is $X' = \{1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 12\}$.

For example, binary matrix representations for R_{10} and $PG(4, 2)$ are given by the matrices A and P shown below.

$$A = \left[\begin{array}{c|ccccc} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ I_5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}\right]$$

$$P = \left[\begin{array}{c|cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc} & 1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1 \\ & 0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1 \\ & 0&0&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1 \\ I_5 & 0&0&0&1&0&1&0&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&1&1&0&0&1&1&0&0&1 \\ & 0&0&0&0&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&1&0&1&0&1&0&1&0&1&1 \end{array}\right]$$

Comparing A and P and adding to A the columns in P missing in A gives us two isomorphism classes. Each class contains several choices for the new column representing the element e in the single-element extension of R_{10}. So, for instance, in Figure 2, the last columm [00011] of Extension 1 may be replaced by any one of the columns in the list to get an isomorphic matroid.

Extension 1:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0
0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0
0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1

Vectors:

[00011]
[00101]
[00110]
[01001]
[01010]
[01100]
[01111]
[10001]
[10010]
[10100]
[10111]
[11000]
[11011]
[11101]
[11110]

Extension 2:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0
0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1
0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1

Vectors:

[01011]
[01101]
[10101]
[10110]
[11010]
[11111]

FIGURE 2. The binary simple single-element extensions of R_{10}

A binary matrix representation for R_{12} is shown below. A coextension of R_{12} has rank 7 and 13 elements. So the selection of rows to add at the bottom will come from $PG(6, 2)$, which is too large to present here.

$$B = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} & 1\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0 \\ & 1\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0 \\ I_6 & 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0 \\ & 0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1 \\ & 0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 1 \\ & 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 1 \end{array}\right]$$

The single-element coextensions of R_{12} are given in Figure 3. The last row [00011] of Extension 1 may be replaced by any one of the rows in the list to get an isomorphic matroid.

Coextension 1:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1
Vectors:
[000011]
[110000]
[110011]

Coextension 2:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1
Vectors:
[000101]
[000110]
[001001]
[001010]
[010100]
[010110]
[011000]
[011010]
[100100]
[100101]
[101000]
[101001]

Coextension 3:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0
Vectors:
[001100]

Coextension 4:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 1
Vectors:
[001101]
[001110]
[011100]
[011101]
[101100]
[101110]

Coextension 5:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1
Vectors:
[001111]
[111100]
[111111]

Coextension 6:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0
Vectors:
[010010]
[010011]
[100001]
[100011]
[110001]
[110010]

Coextension 7:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1
Vectors:
[010101]
[010111]
[011001]
[011011]
[100110]
[100111]
[101010]
[101011]
[110101]
[110110]
[111001]
[111010]

Coextension 8:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 0
Vectors:
[011110]
[011111]
[101101]
[101111]
[111101]
[111110]

Coextension 9:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0
0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 0
0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1
0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1
Vectors:
[110111]
[111011]

FIGURE 3. The binary cosimple single-element coextensions of R_{12}

It is easy to determine if a matroid is non-regular, because a non-regular matroid has an F_7 or F_7^*-minor. Only, the first and third coextension of R_{12} are regular. The connectivity function is also easily determined. When the connectivity function is known, non-minimal exact 3-separations can be easily found. For example, $\lambda(A) = 2$ in R_{12}, where $A = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10\}$.

Once the simple single-element extensions (Type (i) matroids) and cosimple single-element coextensions (Type (ii) matroids) are determined, the number of permissable rows and columns give a bound on the choices for the cosimple single-element extensions of the Type (i) matroids and the simple single-element extensions of the Type (ii) matroids, respectively.

For example, in R_{12} since only the first and third coextension are regular, the only choices for the cosimple single-element coextensions of Type (i) matroids are the four permissable rows in a Type (ii) matroid with a zero and a one, as well as, the rows that are in series with existing rows with the last entry reversed. Similarly, the only choices for the simple single-element extensions of Type (ii) matroids are the four columns in a Type (i) matroid, as well as, the columns that are in parallel with existing columns with the last entry reversed. The structure of the cosimple single-element coextensions of a Type (i) matroid and the simple single-element extensions of a Type (ii) matroid are shown in Figure 4.



FIGURE 4. Structure of M, where $|E(M) - E(N)| = 2$

4. Proof of the Main Theorem

We begin by proving three lemmas on the connectivity function that are used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Let N be a simple and cosimple matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an exact k-separation (A, B). Suppose $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $M\backslash e = N$ and e is not a loop. Then*

(i) *$\lambda_M(A) = k - 1$ if and only if M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup e$;*
(ii) *$\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k - 1$ if and only if M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq A \cup e$.*

Proof. Since (A, B) is an exact k-separation of N, $\lambda_M(A) = k - 1 = \lambda_N(A)$. So,

$$r_M(A) + r_M(B \cup e) - r(M) = r_N(A) + r_N(B) - r(N).$$

Observe that $r(M) = r(N)$ and $r_M(A) = r_N(A)$. Therefore,

$$r_M(B \cup e) = r_N(B) \text{.....(1)}$$

Since e is not a loop, (1) occurs if and only if there is a circuit C_e containing e such that $C_e \subseteq B \cup e$. This completes the proof of Part (i). The proof of (ii) may be obtained by replacing A with B, and noting that $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = \lambda_M(B) = k-1$. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Let N be a simple and cosimple matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an exact k-separation (A, B). Suppose $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $M/f = N$ and f is not a coloop. Then*

(i) *$\lambda_M(A) = k-1$ if and only if M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup f$;*
(ii) *$\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$ if and only if M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq A \cup f$.*

Proof. Again, since $\lambda_M(A) = k-1 = \lambda_N(A)$,

$$r_M(A) + r_M(B \cup f) - r(M) = r_N(A) + r_N(B) - r(N).$$

Observe that $r(M) = r(N) + 1$ and $r_M(B \cup f) = r_N(B) + 1$. Therefore,

$$r_M(A) = r_N(A) \text{.....(2)}$$

But $r_M(A \cup f) = r_N(A) + 1$. So

$$r_M(A \cup f) = r_M(A) + 1.$$

This occurs if and only if there is a hyperplane containing A and avoiding f (since f is not a coloop). It follows that there is a cocircuit D_f containing f such that $D_f \subseteq B \cup f$. The proof of (ii) may be obtained by switching A and B. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let N be a simple and cosimple matroid in $\mathcal{M}$ with an exact k-separation (A, B). Suppose $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is a simple and cosimple matroid such that $M\backslash e/f = N$.*

(i) *If $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$, then $\lambda_M(A) = k-1$.*
(ii) *If $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$, then $\lambda_M(A \cup \{e, f\}) = k-1$.*

Proof. Observe that, M/f is a single-element extension of N by element e and $M\backslash e$ is a single-element coextension of N by element f (see Figure 5). Since $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$, Lemma 4.1(i) implies that M/f has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup e$. Since $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$, Lemma 4.2(i) implies that $M\backslash e$ has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup f$. It follows that,

$$r_M(A) = r_{M\backslash e}(A) = r_N(A)$$

and

$$r_M(B \cup \{e, f\}) = r_{M/f}(B \cup e) + 1 = r_N(B) + 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_M(A) &= r_M(A) + r_M(B \cup \{e, f\}) - r(M) \\ &= r_{M\backslash e}(A) + r_{M/f}(B \cup e) + 1 - r(N) - 1 \\ &= r_N(A) + r_N(B) - r(N) \\ &= \lambda_N(A) \\ &= k-1 \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (ii) may be obtained by switching A and B. $\square$



FIGURE 5. $M\backslash e/f = N$

We will also use standard properties of circuits and cocircuits. Suppose M is a simple and cosimple matroid with the property that $M/f = N$, where N has no loops nor coloops. Let C be a circuit of M. If $f \in C$, then $C - f$ is a circuit in M/f. If $f \notin C$, then C is a circuit or union of circuits in M/f. Looking at things the other way around, let C' be a circuit in N. Then either C' remains a circuit in M or $C' \cup f$ is a circuit in M.

Likewise for cocircuits. Suppose M is a simple and cosimple matroid with the property that $M\backslash e = N$, where N has no loops nor coloops. Let D be a cocircuit of M. If $e \in D$, then $D - e$ is a cocircuit in $M\backslash e$. If $e \notin D$, then D is a cocircuit or union of cocircuits in $M\backslash e$. Let D' be a circuit in N. Then either D' remains a cocircuit in M or $D' \cup e$ is a cocircuit in M.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We prove that Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to Theorem 2.2. Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 show that Theorem 1.1(i) and (ii) are equivalent to Theorem 2.2(i) and (ii), respectively. We must show that Theorem 1.1(iii) is equivalent to Theorem 2.2(iii). First, assume Theorem 2.2(iii) holds. Let us consider four cases:

Case 1. Suppose $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$. Then Lemma 4.3(i) implies that $\lambda_M(A) = k-1$. By Lemma 4.1(i) and Lemma 4.2(i) this happens if and only if M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup e$ and a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup f$. The conditions in Theorem 2.2(iii) are satisfied.

Case 2. Suppose $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$. Then, by hypothesis $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triad or triangle with $g \in A$ or $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$. In the first case there is nothing to show since the conditions in Theorem 2.2(iii) are satisfied. Therefore, suppose $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$. Then since $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$ and $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$ and M is a simple single-element extension of $M\backslash e$, Lemma 4.1(i) implies that M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup e$. So Theorem 2.2(iii)(b) is satisfied.

Since $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$ and M is a cosimple single-element coextension of M/f, Lemma 4.2 (ii) implies that M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq A \cup f$. Now, suppose, if possible M has a circuit R such that $\{e, f\} \subseteq R \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Then $R \cap D_f = \{f\}$; a contradiction. Therefore, Theorem 2.2(iii)(a) is vacuously satisfied.

Case 3. Suppose $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$. Then by hypothesis $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triad or triangle with $g \in A$ or $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$. In the first case there is nothing to show as in Case 2. Therefore, suppose $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$. Then since $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ and $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$ and M is a cosimple single-element coextension of M/f, Lemma

4.2(i) implies that M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup f$. So Theorem 2.2(iii)(a) is satisfied.

Since $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$ and M is a simple single-element extension of $M\backslash e$, Lemma 4.1(ii) implies that M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq A \cup e$. Now, suppose, if possible M has a cocircuit R such that $\{e, f\} \subseteq R \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Then, $R \cap C_e = \{e\}$; a contradiction. Therefore, Theorem 2.2(iii)(b) is vacuously satisfied.

Case 4. Finally, suppose $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$. Then, by hypothesis $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triad or triangle in M with $g \in A$, which satisfies the conditions in Theorem 2.2(iii).

Conversely, assume Theorem 2.2(iii) holds. Again, let us consider four cases:

Case 1. Suppose M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ and a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Then $M\backslash e$ has a cocircuit D'_f such that $f \in D'_f \subseteq B \cup f$. By Lemma 4.1(ii) this occurs if and only if $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$. Similarly, M/f has a circuit C'_e such that $e \in C'_e \subseteq B \cup e$. By Lemma 4.2(ii) this occurs if and only if $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$. So Theorem 1.1(iii)(a) is satisfied.

Case 2. Suppose M has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$, but no circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ and $\{e, f, g\}$ is not a triangle with $g \in A$. Then, by an argument similar to Case 1, $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M/f}(A) \neq k-1$. We may assume that $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$.

By hypothesis, there is no cocircuit R such that $\{e, f\} \subseteq R \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. So the cocircuit D_f is such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup f$. It follows from Lemma 4.1(ii) that $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$ if and only if M/f has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq A \cup e$. Suppose $C_e \cup f$ is a circuit in M. Then $C_e \cap D_f = \{f\}$; a contradiction. So C_e stays a circuit in M. It follows that $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = k-1$, and the condition in Theorem 1.1(iii)(c) is satisfied.

Case 3. Suppose M has no cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$, and $\{e, f, g\}$ is not a triad with $g \in A$, but M has a circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Then, by an argument similar to Case 1, $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) \neq k-1$ and $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = k-1$. We may assume that $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$.

By hypothesis, there is no circuit R such that $\{e, f\} \subseteq R \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. So the circuit C_e is such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup e$. It follows from Lemma 4.2(ii) that $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$ if and only if $M\backslash e$ has a cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq A \cup f$. Suppose $D_f \cup e$ is a cocircuit in M. Then $D_f \cap C_e = \{e\}$; a contradiction. So D_f stays a cocircuit in M. It follows that $\lambda_M(A \cup f) = k-1$ and Theorem 1.1(iii)(b) is satisfied.

Case 4. Suppose M has no circuit C_e such that $e \in C_e \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$ and no cocircuit D_f such that $f \in D_f \subseteq B \cup \{e, f\}$. Then by an argument similar to Case 1, $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) \neq k-1$ and $\lambda_{M/f}(A) \neq k-1$. We may assume that $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A \cup f) = k-1$ and $\lambda_{M/f}(A \cup e) = k-1$. Lemma 4.3(ii) implies that $\lambda_M(A \cup \{e, f\}) = k-1$. However, in this situation, the exact 3-separation is not necessarily maintained in 3-connected matroids containing M, as shown by the example at the end of the next section. So, in this case the only possibility is for $\{e, f, g\}$ to be a triangle or triad with $g \in A$. Hence the condition in Theorem 1.1(iii)(d) is satisfied. □

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Since A is a 4-element circuit and cocircuit in N and its simple single-element extensions and cosimple single-element coextensions, $\lambda(A) = 2$ in all these matroids. Hence, the conditions in Theorem 1.1(i) and (ii) are immediately satisfied. Suppose $M\backslash e/f = N$ and $M\backslash e$ is simple and M/f is cosimple, then the result follows from Theorem 1.1(iii)(a). It remains to consider the case when either $M\backslash e$ is not cosimple or M/f is not simple.

Suppose $M\backslash e$ is not cosimple. Then $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triad in M and f is in series to an element g in $M\backslash e$. If $g \in A$, then Theorem 1.1 (iii)(b) holds. If $g \in B$, there is a cocircuit $\{f, g\} \subset B \cup f$ containing f. By Lemma 4.2(i), $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = 2$ and Theorem 1.1(iii)(a) is satisfied.

Suppose M/f is not simple. Then $\{e, f, g\}$ is a triangle in M and f is parallel to an element g in M/f. If $g \in A$, then Theorem 1.1(iii)(c) holds. If $g \in B$, then there is a circuit $\{f, g\} \subset B \cup f$ containing f. By Lemma 4.1(i), $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = 2$ and Theorem 1.1(iii)(a) is satisfied. □

5. R_{12} is a 3-decomposer for regular matroids

Recall that, R_{12} has a non-minimal exact 3-separation (A, B), where $A = \{3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12\}$ and $B = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10\}$. Both A and B are the union of circuits and the union of cocircuits (this is just a coincidence). Using Theorem 1.1, the biggest reduction in computation occurs when computing M, where $M\backslash e/f = N$ because if $\lambda_{M/f}(A) = 2$ and $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = 2$, there is no need to check M.

Theorem 4.1. *R_{12} is a 3-decomposer for regular matroids.*

Proof. R_{12} has two non-isomorphic single-element extensions that are regular, namely, P_{13} and Q_{13}, where P_{13} is formed by adding any one of the columns $\alpha = [000011]$, $\beta = [110000]$, or $\gamma = [110011]$ and Q_{13} is formed by adding column $\delta = [001100]$. We can check that $\lambda(A) = 2$ for the first three columns, but for the last column $d = [001100]$, $\lambda(A \cup e) = 2$

Since R_{12} is self-dual (and this particular representation is symmetric) R_{12} has two non-isomorphic single-element coextensions that are regular, namely P^*_{13} and Q^*_{13}, where P^*_{13} is formed by adding any one of the rows $a = [000011]$, $b = [110000]$, or $c = [110011]$ and Q^*_{13} is formed by adding row $d = [001100]$. We can check that $\lambda(A) = 2$ for all four rows. Therefore, the conditions in Theorem 1.1(i) and (ii) are met.

Next, suppose M is a cosimple single-element coextension of a Type (i) matroid such that $M\backslash e/f = N$. By Theorem 1.1(iii) the only M whose connectivity condition we must check is M where M/f is formed by the column [001100]. In other words, we must check the cosimple coextensions of Q_{13} formed by adding rows a, b, c, or d with a zero or a one at the end and the rows corresponding to entries in B with the last entry reversed, namely, $1' = [111001]$, $2' = [1101001]$, $5' = [0010110]$, $6' = [0001111]$, $10' = [0010001]$, $11' = [0001001]$ because for these rows $\lambda_{M\backslash e}(A) = 2$. Table 1a shows that in all cases where the matroid is regular, $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = 2$. So Theorem 1.1(iii) is satisfied.

Lastly, suppose M is a simple single-element extension of a Type (ii) matroid such that $M\backslash e/f = N$. By Theorem 1.1(iii) we must check every coextension of R_{12}, but the only

columns we have to add to the coextension are [0011000] and [0011001]. Table 1b shows that in all cases where the matroid is regular, $\lambda_M(A \cup e) = 2$. So Theorem 1.1(iii) is satisfied. □

	Coext. Rows	**F_7 or F_7^*-minor**	**3-separation or triad**
Q_{13} with column [001100]	[0000110]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[0000111]	YES	
	[1100000]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[1100001]	YES	
	[1100110]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[1100111]	YES	
	[0011000]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[0011001]	YES	
	[1110001]	YES	
	[1101001]	YES	
	[0010110]	YES	
	[0001111]	YES	
	[0010001]	YES	
	[0001001]	YES	

Table 1a: Regular cosimple single-element coextensions of Q_{13}

	Ext. Columns	**F_7 or F_7^*-minor**	**3-separation**
P_{13}^* with row [0000011]	[0011000]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[00110001]	YES	
P_{13}^* with row [110000]	[0011000]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[0011001]	YES	
P_{13}^* with row [1100011]	[0011000]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[0011001]	YES	
Q_{13}^* with row [001100]	[0011000]	No	$\lambda\{3,4,8,9,12,13,\mathbf{14}\} = 2$
	[0011001]	YES	

Table 1b: Regular simple single-element extensions of P_{13}^* and Q_{13}^*

Observe that R_{12} is a very simple example of a 3-decomposer. It has few regular extensions and coextensions and not only is it self-dual, but the representation we are using is symmetric. Additionally, both A and B are union of circuits and union of cocircuits and as such interchangable. All this makes it an easy computational example. However, the algorithmic approach developed in this paper makes it possible to find more complicated 3-decomposers when there are many extensions and coextensions in the excluded minor class. In fact, it reduces the entire process of finding a 3-decomposer to the click of a button. This method will allow us to find 3-decomposers when it is no longer feasible to check the computations by hand or even display the tables as shown here.

Finally, we give an example to show that there is no symmetry between A and B that would allow us to conclude in step Theorem 1.1(iii) that $\lambda_M(A \cup \{e,f\}) = k-1$ is acceptable, except when $\{e,f,g\}$ is a triad with $g \in A$. Consider the 10-element rank-5 matroid $M[X]$

shown below. It has a non-minimal exact 3-separation (A, B) where $A = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10\}$ and $\lambda_X(A) = 2$.

$$X = \left[\begin{array}{c|ccccc} & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ I_5 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right]$$

If we extend X by column [11000], we get a matroid Y with the property that $\lambda_Y(A) = 2$. Now, let us coextend Y by [110011] to get the matroid Z. In Z, $\lambda_Z(A) \neq 2$, $\lambda_Z(A \cup \{6\}) \neq 2$ and there is no triad $\{e, f, g\}$ with $g \in A$, but $\lambda_Z(A \cup \{6, 12\}) = 2$. Next, let us coextend Y by row [111001] to get the matroid Z'. In Z', $\lambda_{Z'}(A) = 2$. However, if we coextend Y by both rows [110011] and [111001] we get the matroid Q_{13} shown below that is internally 4-connected.

$$Q_{13} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cccccc} & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ I_7 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right]$$

In terms of Theorem 2.2, the matroid Z has a circuit R such that $\{12, 6\} \subseteq R \subseteq B \cup \{12, 6\}$, but no cocircuit D such that $6 \in D \subset B \cup \{12, 6\}$ and there is no triad of the form $\{12, 6, g\}$ with $g \in A$. As noted earlier, this example also serves to show that a 2-element check for the presence of non-minimal exact 3-separations will not do for binary matroids. The conditions in Seymour's Decomposition Theorem and consequently in Theorem 1.1 are best possible.

Acknowledgements: The author thanks James Oxley for being a mentor for over 20 years and Manoel Lemos for assistance with the proof of Theorem 2.2.

References

(1) D. Mayhew, G. Royle, and G. Whittle (2011) The internally 4-connected binary matroids with no $M(K_{3,3})$-minor. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* **981**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island.

(2) J. G. Oxley (1992) *Matroid Theory*, Second Edition (2011), Oxford University Press, New York.

(3) P. D. Seymour (1980) Decomposition of regular matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **28**, (1980) 305-359.